

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1-3 and 5-6 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 4 has been amended. New claims 7-12 have been added. Claims 4 and 7-12 are now pending.

Title

The title has been amended to be more descriptive.

Claim objections

Claims 1, 4 and 5 were objected to for informalities. These objections are moot with respect to claims 1 and 5, which have been cancelled. Claim 4 has been amended to address the issues raised in the Office Action, and applicant submits the objections have been overcome.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. These rejections are moot with respect to claims 1-3 and 5-6, which have been cancelled. Claim 4 has been amended to address the issues raised in the Office Action, and applicant submits the rejections have been overcome.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,265,524 to Compton et al. ("Compton"). Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-11 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Compton in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,128 to Yamakawa et al. ("Yamakawa"). Insofar as these rejections may be applied to the claims as amended, applicant respectfully traverses for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 4 and 11 both recite "a mirror provided in the vicinity of another side in the housing, which reflects the laser beam deflected by the polygon mirror at a predetermined angle to guide the laser beam outside the housing; and a projection provided

on an outer surface of the housing between the polygon mirror and the mirror, wherein the housing is rotated about the projection.” Compton and Yamakawa neither suggest this combination of features, nor its advantages.

Compton discloses an optical scanner with an enclosure 22, a source 30 of a laser light beam, and a multifaceted line-scanning prism reflector 44. The scanner includes a support 26 that is rotatable over a total angular displacement range of 90 degrees (col. 1, lines 54-59).

In contrast to claims 4 and 11, however, the apparatus of Compton does not comprise elements corresponding to the mirror “provided in the vicinity of another side in the housing,” or the projection “provided on an outer surface of the housing between the polygon mirror and the mirror.”

Yamakawa, was cited for disclosing a developing device, transfer device, and fixing device, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Compton.

Moreover, neither Compton nor Yamakawa suggest the advantages of the arrangement of the projection between the polygon mirror and the mirror in preventing displacement of an exposure light spot when adjusting tilt. When the rotation shaft for the housing is arranged between the polygon mirror and the mirror (arranged on different sides of the housing), the amount of displacement is small when the tilt is adjusted (See present specification on pages 11-12, bridging paragraph). Compton fails to disclose any such mirror as recited in claims 4 and 11, nor a projection arranged between a polygon mirror and the mirror, where the housing is rotated about the projection. Thus, Compton fails to realize the advantages of the arrangement of claims 4 and 11 in reducing the amount of displacement when tilt is adjusted. Yamakawa discloses the housing 16 is rotated with a pin 11a being the center of rotation (col. 6, lines 10-15). The pin 11a, however is not arranged between the polygonal mirror 1 and mirror 5 (See FIG. 5), and thus Yamakawa likewise does not realize the advantages of the arrangement of claims 4 and 11 in reducing the amount of displacement when tilt is adjusted.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as for further patentable features recited therein.


Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance.
Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date October 12, 2005
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By 
Pavan K. Agarwal
Registration No. 40,888

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Registration No. 43,438

Attorneys for Applicant